

Dear Sir or Madam:

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision for their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of what dangers can result from placing too much power in a media monopoly.

Because Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, it is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when it induces (forces) all the stations under its ownership to broadcast a program detrimental to the interests of one candidate and conducive to the benefit of the other, it's highly undemocratic and largely unforgivable. It is also illustrative of how too much power in too few hands can lead to reprehensible behavior.

Sinclair's barefaced attempt to sway public opinion unopposed by any contrary viewpoint demonstrates why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

Marc Krug